

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 8 has been amended.

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; (c) does not add any additional claims; and (d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that the proposed drawing corrections are acceptable. Applicants will thus file appropriate formal drawings upon receipt of a Notice of Allowance. Applicants note that there is no requirement to file formal drawings at this stage of prosecution.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, claim 8 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Haneda et al. (Haneda), U. S. Patent No. 4,996,634 in view of Suzuki, U. S. Patent No. 4,809,144. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Haneda and Suzuki fail to disclose or suggest a combination of a car bumper and light unit, the light unit having as component elements both a housing suitable for containing at least one light source and a glass enabling light emitted by the light source to be diffused, wherein the outside skin of the car bumper includes an arrangement forming at least a portion of at least one of the component elements of the light unit, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claim 10.

As such, the outside skin of the car bumper forms at least one component element of the light unit. As shown in Applicants' Fig. 3 for example, the at least one component element formed by the outside skin of the car bumper includes the housing suitable for containing at least one light source. A light unit without this component element would not fulfill its purpose anymore because there would not be any structure to carry the bulb. Applicants' claimed invention is also advantageous in reducing the volume occupied by the rigid portions of the light unit so that any deformation of the car bumper surrounding the light unit can take place without the rigid portions of the light unit being harmed (specification, page 2, lines 18-24).

Haneda discloses a bumper shell 1 with a signal lamp 10 attached to the bumper shell 1 (col. 3, lines 18 and 19). The signal lamp 10, which includes a bulb 17, is attached to the bumper shell 1 such that the signal lamp 10 moves in a direction of the center of the vehicle so as to slide within the flanges 15, 16 when the shock absorber 2 is compressed (col. 3, lines 29-40).

As such, the bumper shell 1 does not form one of the component elements of Haneda's light unit because the light unit of Haneda only comprises the signal lamp 10 with bulb 17. In other words, Haneda's bumper shell 1 is not a component element of a light unit because the bumper shell 1 is not an essential part of a light unit. The light unit of Haneda only includes the signal lamp 10 with bulb 17 because the signal lamp can fulfill its purpose without the bumper shell 1.

Haneda also suffers deficiencies that Applicants' claims 1 and 10 overcomes. In particular, the signal lamp 10 is situated within the bumper shell 1. As such, it is difficult to position the signal lamp 10 and the bumper shell 1 because of deformations due to thermal dilation and mechanical constraints. Thus, the signal lamp 10 affixed to the car does not follow bodywork deformation and gaps appear between the bumper shell 1 and the signal

lamp 10. Applicants overcome this deficiency by providing light units that accommodate for the deformations of the pieces of bodywork that surround them with the invention as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Suzuki fails to overcome the deficiencies of Haneda because Suzuki only discloses a vehicle headlamp (Fig. 1) that is attached to a vehicle (not shown). As such, Suzuki similarly fails to disclose or suggest the features of Applicants' claims 1 and 10.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Haneda and Suzuki fail to disclose or suggest the features recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 10. In addition, claims 2-9 recite additional features of the invention and are also believed to be allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024

Scott M. Schulte  
Registration No. 44,325

WPB:SMS/sxb

Date: January 2, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--